

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed December 23, 2004. At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending in this Application. Claim 21 was previously cancelled by Applicants without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-20 were rejected. Claim 1 has been amended to further define various features of Applicants' invention. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-13, 15-18 and 20

Claims 1-13, 15-18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,189,063 issued to David W. Rekeita et al. ("Rekeita") in view of U.S. Patent 6,519,671 issued to Keitaro Kondou et al. ("Kondou").

Each of Independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 include claim limitations directed to two or more host bridge elements. For example, Claim 1 recites, "at least two installed bootable devices, each having a respective host bridge associated therewith for connecting with a host bus." Claim 8 recites, among other elements, "determining a host bridge number associated with each bus number of the computer system, wherein the host bridge number is associated with one of a plurality of host bridges." Claim 15 recites, among other elements, "determining a host bridge number associated with each bootable device ... wherein the host bridge number is associated with one of a plurality of host bridges."

Applicants have previously argued that neither Rekeita nor Kondou, alone or in combination, disclose teach or suggest systems that involve more than a single host bridge. Applicants again submit that the cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest the multiple (two or more) host bridges recited in Claims 1, 8 and 15.

Examiner has argued that Rekeita discloses two bridges. Specifically, Examiner argues that the PCI bridge of Figure 1 "serves as a host bridge to PCI devices within block 44." See 12/23/04 Office Action, page 2. Applicants traverse. As shown in the description

of the present application, host bridges (elements 16a, 16b and 16c) each connect the host bus 14 to a PCI bus (20a, 20b and 20c, respectively). Similarly, the host bridge 22 of Rekeita connects host bus 14 to PCI bus 26. See Figure 1. Clearly, a host bridge connects a host bus with another communication bus.

The description of the present invention also includes a “PCI-to-PCI Bridge” element 39 connected with PCI bus 20a that “allows one or more devices, bootable or otherwise, to be coupled thereto and generally adds one or more system buses to computer system 10.” See page 8, lines 8-11. Similarly, Figure 1 of Rekeita shows PCI-PCI Bridge elements 38 and 41. PCI Bridge 1 (element 38) connects PCI Bus 0 (element 26) and PCI Bus 1 (element 42). PCI Bridge 2 connects a PCI option slot (which is in communication with PCI Bus 1 (element 42.)) See Figure 1. As its name suggests, a PCI-to-PCI Bridge connects two PCI Buses.

Applicants submit that the PCI-PCI Bridge elements do not disclose or teach a second host bridge. The PCI-PCI Bridges do not link directly to a host bus and thus cannot be considered to disclose teach or suggest a host bridge as claimed in the present embodiments. Additionally, Kondou does not disclose, teach or suggest multiple host buses as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant submit that Rekeita and Kondou, either alone or in combination, fails to teach every limitation of the claimed embodiment. Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections under §103 and full allowance of Independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 and Claims 2-13, 16-18, and 20 which depend therefrom.

Claims 14 and 19

Claims 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rekeita in view of Kondou, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,761,448 issued to Alan P. Adamson et al. (“Adamson”). Applicants submit that Claims 14 and 19 depend from claims that have now been placed in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections under §103 and full allowance of Independent Claims 14 and 19.

Change of Correspondence Address

Applicants respectfully request that all papers pertaining to the above-captioned patent application be directed to Customer No. 23640 and all telephone calls should be directed to Brian E. Szymczak at 512.322.2548. Applicants enclose a Change of Correspondence Address for the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office records.

CONCLUSION


Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1-20 as amended.

Applicants believe there are no additional fees due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0383 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2545.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Brian E. Szymczak
Reg. No. 47,120

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:
Baker Botts L.L.P.
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. 23640
512.322.2548
512.322.8340 (fax)

Date: 3/3/05